

## INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

## REILLY TAR AND CHEMICAL CORPO

US EPA RECORDS CENTER REGION 5



514860

TO: Mr. W. J. McLellan, St. Louis Park,

OFFICE: Indianapolis, Indiana.

FROM: C. B. Edwards,

DATE: Sept. 17, 1938.

SUBJECT: ST. LOUIS PARK - DRAINAGE

Mr. Reilly has referred to me the correspondence on this subject and I have your letters of August 17th and 29th before me.

Mr. Kemp has made a very serious and damaging report which sounds as though we had been very negligent as regards waste from the plant. Each item must be taken up and answered specifically. The only information we have here is that contained in the analysis of the two samples you sent us, one of soil and one of water from the drainage ditch. The drainage ditch water contains a very large amount of phenol, 109 parts per million, and this figure should not be reported to Mr. Kemp because it must be erroneous in that the sample is not representative of your waste water. Waste water from other plants has nothing like this amount of phenol in it and therefore you should take further samples at various intervals and send them to us. In accumulating the samples over a week you may have included one sample that contained a large amount of phenol, an unusual condition.

There are many errors in Mr. Kemp's report some of which you have pointed out. The mud layer we analyzed contained 5.35% oil which is quite high. The sample must have been taken at a point where oil accumulated in unusually large amounts. It is certainly not representative of the soil in this vicinity. Coming from the bed of the ditch it would naturally contain more oil than any other soil in that vicinity because the oil is heavier than water and would sink to the bottom of the ditch and be retained there. The ditch itself is acting as a filter bed. Samples should be taken of the soil away from the ditch in the vicinity that Mr. Kemp thinks has been affected by our drainage. I do not think we will find any more phenol in that soil than is normally found in that kind of property.

Have there actually been any complaints because of water taken from nearby wells ?

When taking some of the water samples from the ditch as above suggested take some of them at a time we are not operating the acid plant and keep the samples separate. You should also send us samples of your sodium sulphate solution.

Under sample 60493 Mr. Kemp says that this sample shows "large quantities of phenol". I am sure this is erroneous and we must prove it so.

Under sample 60494 Mr. Kemp says "it contained about 25 percent settleable oil and tar acids by volume, had a high pH, and contained a large quantity of total solids which were volatile when ignited". It goes on to tell what the material was likely to contain, etc. What was this material and why was he given such a sample if it did contain so much oil and acid ? It certainly is not representative

C 303194

## REILLY TAR AND CHEMICAL CORPORATION

TO:

OFFICE:

FROM:

DATE: Sept. 17, 1938.

SUBJECT:

Page #2

of our waste water.

The next sample #60509 he says is "30% sodium sulfate and a large amount of phenol". This material is not wasted in that form and does not contain a large amount of phenol.

We have been going into the question of drainage at Maywood and I am sending this correspondence to Mr. Courtney and Mr. Horner for study and I expect to have another letter to you early next week. Please wait until you receive this letter before making any reply to Mr. Kemp. In the mean time the samples can be taken.

If you have been negligent in allowing oils and acids to get into your drainage water that should be corrected immediately. Then if Mr. Kemp takes further samples the results may be such that he can change the tone of his report entirely.

Very truly yours,

*C. B. Edwards*

C. B. Edwards

CBE:mec

c303195